Lisa Blumerman: Okay, Good afternoon. It looks like everyone is pretty much getting settled. We have a few people still looking for their seats, but while they're doing that I think we can get started because we do have a very, very full agenda today.

So, good afternoon. Welcome, everyone. Thank you so, so much for coming today - for coming out today or even just for watching today's program management review.

It's a very, very exciting milestone for us as we roll out the operational plan for the 2020 Census.

We have an absolutely awesome day ahead of us - afternoon ahead of us so I would like to start with some of the housekeeping items and then we'll move on into the meat of our presentation.

So just a few of the - there we go. So just a few of the housekeeping items that you're - many of you are familiar with as you've attended our program management reviews many times before, the first is, I would just remind you that the meeting is being broadcast via publicly-available web broadcast. You need to consider as you're having conversations in the room that while your mic may be off the room is actually mic'd. So anything you say can be or potentially can be picked up. So we do just remind you about that.

Also, there are some legal requirements that we have to follow when we are working with contractors or with potential contractors. And for that I'd actually like to turn it over to Mike Palensky who's just going to give us a few words.

Mike Palensky: Hi, Lisa.

Since we have a lot of contractors we (got to remember) we're webcasting and it's live for the most part, everybody can see it, please refrain from having conversations that - information that is not publicly available. Okay? There are contractors, people who need to know, so there's a lot of conversations, there's incumbents in our offices throughout the Census Bureau, so just please refrain and stick to what is publicly available.

So when we release something like this this is publicly available. You can talk about that. But you can't release any other details beyond what's publicly available, okay, to keep that level playing field.

Thanks, Lisa.

Lisa Blumerman: Okay. Thank you, Mike.

For questions -- when we do get to question-and-answers -- we have allowed for ample time in all of the discussions today to allow for questions. Please do turn your microphones on. You need to push the little button to do that. Please state your name and your affiliation so that those of us in the room know who's asking the question as well as those who are watching via webcast.

I'd also remind you where the restrooms are. The restrooms are out the doors and back that way and then to your right. There are also some along the main hallway to the left.

And in the case of an emergency -- while we don't expect that there will be an emergency -- we do have an emergency exit over here and as well if you go out the doors the emergency exits are right out there as well.

Again, as I said, for questions, Q&A is encouraged. We do only have a few hours this afternoon and we have a lot to cover so some of the questions we

may table to answer offline. And, of course, we do encourage you to email us at 2020.Census.pmr@Census.gov. And of course we'll collect all of these questions and respond appropriately.

With that what I'd like to do is go over what today's agenda is.

Today we're going to do some very brief updates. I promise to keep this welcome to a short time period as I possibly can, but a few brief updates on the overall health of the program. Mostly what I'd like to do is to introduce you all to some of our new or in some cases newer faces in the room we've been very successful in bringing on staff to help us with the 2020 program.

We'll then spend the bulk of the afternoon in a panel presentation as you see on the design of the 2020 Census.

After we conclude the discussion about the design of the 2020 Census, Shirin will then lead us through the remainder of the afternoon and focusing on our current operations. We'll do a quick update on our current National Content Test that's underway right now, and then we'll conclude with a discussion of our testing plans for 2016.

So, as you all know, over the past couple of years I've talked a lot about the Decennial Directorate's reorganization and where we were in the reorganization and how far along we were and what that would mean for us as an organization. A couple PMR's ago we were able to tell you that reorganization was approved but we still had a lot of vacancies. Today I can tell you that we're actively working on filling many of those vacancies and I'd like to take just a moment to introduce you to just a few of the new members of our management team.

I think we've met Shirin at the last - perhaps two program management reviews. I'm pleased to say that she is here working with us and she's taking - she's helped us all in more ways than we can even begin to count in getting our programs underway, keeping our operations on track and really bringing the 2020 Census into the next level.

I'd also announce Carol Brady. I'm not sure if she's in the room. If she is she can stand. And actually for all of the people that I am - if you'd like to stand when I recognize you that would be great. So people can put a face with the name.

But Carol is Chief of the Configuration Release and SDLC Management Branch in our Information Technology Division.

Jessica has (unintelligible) I believe at the last program management review. And actually she is out on travel right now heading out to the first of our tribal consultations.

Somonica Green is back with the 2020 program and she is in the room. Welcome back, Somonica. I believe she just started with us this week. So we're glad to have her back.

Julie Grosman. I didn't see Julie when I came in. Julie is one of our new Chiefs of our Geocoding Systems Branch in our Information Technology Division.

Alexa Jones-Puthoff who I did see - welcome Alexa. Welcome back to the Census Bureau. Alexa is our new Assistant Division Chief for Infrastructure in our Decennial Census Management Division.

Atri Kalluri. I know Atri is back there. Atri is our new Division Chief for our Decennial Information Technology Division.

I didn't see Maria when I came in the room. Maria, are you in here -- Maria Malagon? Okay, I'd like to welcome Maria back to the Decennial Directorate. Maria is our new Assistant Division Chief for Management and Data User Education in our American Community Survey Office.

And Jackie, I don't think she's in the room as well. Jackie, also with the American Community Survey Office, is our new Chief of the Data Processing Coordination Branch.

Darling Richards. I didn't see her come in. Welcome in her back to the Decennial Directorate. She is our Deputy Program Manager for the Center for Enterprise Dissemination Services and Consumer Innovation.

Lisa Thompson. Lisa Thompson has taken a new role within the Decennial Directorate. She's our Chief of our Decennial SharePoint Administration Branch in our Information Technology Division.

Darlene Ursitti. Darlene is not here as well. Darlene is the Chief of our Decennial Directorate Support Services Office.

Ceci Villa Ross. She's over there. Ceci, welcome back to the program. Ceci is our new Branch Chief of our Stakeholder Relations Staff in the Decennial Communications Coordination Office.

And the last announcement I would make is James Whitehorne. And I don't think James is here either. James is the Chief of our Redistricting and Voting Rights Data Office.

So with that I wanted to highlight just a couple of other things. As we all know -- as we're doing our updates -- in terms of the budget for the 2020 Census program we are currently operating under a continuing resolution in FY '16 as we all are and budget and timing of the funding continue to be red risks for the program as we enter into fiscal year '16.

I did want to point out before we got into the meat of today that we do have a number of major milestones for - to occur in fiscal year '16. Of course we have our 2016 Census test witch Shirin will be talking about later today. We have our 2016 address canvassing test which will occur at the end of fiscal year '16 heading into fiscal year '17.

We're in the process now of conducting the CEDCaP analysis of alternatives which will help us better understand our capabilities and where we are going with our CEDCaP system. We also plan to award our Census Questionnaire Assistance Contract in fiscal year '16. If funding permits we plan to award our Integrated Communication and Partnership Contract. And as I mentioned just a moment ago, just this week we're kicking off out tribal consultations.

Those are just a number of the many activities that we actually have underway right now in fiscal year '16.

And with that just as a brief introduction, what I'd like to do -- and I am right on schedule -- is move us straight into the rollout of the 2020 Census operational plan unless there are any questions about that program introduction.

And so we have any one in the overflow room?

I'm thinking we don't right now because the room is still pretty full.

Okay. So with that we're going to jump right in.

So what I'd like to do know is turn in to the meat of today's presentation, the substance of today's presentation, the design of the 2020 Census and the development of the operational plan.

While there are just a few of us sitting up here today giving the main presentation, I really do think it's important to recognize and acknowledge that the development of the operational plan has truly been a collective effort. And I'd like to pause now and just briefly thank and acknowledge all of those in the program that made this happen.

At the conclusion of the discussion of the operational plan I'm going to return to this, but I'd actually like to start with just a few recognitions now.

First of all I'd like to start by recognizing the senior leadership of the Decennial Directorate starting with Shirin. I saw Deb Stempowski in the back of the room. Tim Trainor is out on travel. Pat Cantwell, Deirdre Bishop, Atri Kalluri.

Without their help, without their assistance, the operational plan that we're really seeing today, that we're rolling out today would not have been able to be prepared in the time period that we have.

I also would like to pause and acknowledge the regional directors who are also here with us today -- Fernando Armstrong, Jeff Behler, Jamie Christy. Al Fontenot is not. I believe he's out on travel heading to the tribal consultations. But George Grandy is over there sitting next to Cathy Lacy and, of course, Dave Hackbarth who I saw - where did he go. Oh, he's over there now. And Dave Hackbarth.

Over the last few months we've spent a considerable amount of time really working with the regional directors as we were developing the operational plan talking through the implications of some of the design decisions. And because of their help and their attention to this and our ability to work collectively we have a much, much stronger program and I thank them for that.

Lastly, I wanted to thank the Census Bureau's - not lastly, but lastly for this part I wanted to thank the Census Bureau's senior leadership team, our Executive Steering Committee -- John Thompson, Nancy Potok, Joanne Crane, Enrique Lamas, Harry Lee, Tom Louis, Tim Olson, and Jeannie Shiffer.

As we've progressed throughout the year with our Executive Steering Committee, our updates, our discussions about the methodology, the decisions we were making, the feedback we got, all of that contributed to making the much stronger plan. And I would like to take a moment to thank all of these people for helping us build the plan we have today. So please join me in recognizing everyone.

So with that let me jump in to the presentation itself and the design of the Census.

Today's discussion as you all know reflects the culmination of years of research and testing. And we are so excited to be here today to be able to roll out the operational plan and the design of the 2020 Census.

I think it's really important as we begin this discussion to set the stage. And as we set the stage it's really important to remember where we are in the life-cycle of the 2020 Census and where we need to go with that life-cycle.

We are still five years out from the actual execution of the Census. And as it would be expected -- because we are five years out -- we don't have all the answers to all the questions that we might need for the entirety of the Census today. What we do have today are all of the answers to the questions that we must answer today.

And in addition to knowing the answers to the questions that we need to know today, we now know and have documented when we will need to have and what those questions are that we need to answer the remainder. And that's what's most important about where we are today.

So let me start with the bottom line as we begin.

Due to everyone's hard work, the amazing test that we've concluded, the creativity and innovation in our methodologies, the 2020 Census is estimated to cost $12.5 billion compared with the cost of repeating the design of the 2010 Census of $17.8 billion. This represents $5.2 billion in cost avoidance for the 2020 Census.

Another way to look at this is that the 2020 Census if executed the way we have designed it today will realize a lower per cost per housing unit than the 2010 Census. The 2010 Census estimated cost per housing unit would have been $124 per housing unit. Our design today has an estimated cost of $88 per housing unit.

So why do we do this? Why do we conduct the Census?

I know for most of you this is very familiar information, but for the benefit of all let me provide just some brief background on why we actually take the decennial Census.

Our purpose is to conduct the Census of population and housing and disseminate the results to the president, the states and the American people.

The Census data that we collect are used for a whole variety of purposes. For the purpose of today's discussion I'll focus just on two.

The first purpose that I'll focus on is that by December 31 of 2020 with a nine-month of Census day we must provide accounts for apportionment. And that is a date that we cannot miss and we will not miss.

The second purpose that I will highlight for today is that within one year of Census day, by March 31 of 2021, we must provide the data for redistricting. Again, these are legislative mandates that we will make and it helps us understand the context in which we take the decennial Census.

As we look to plan the Census, one of the things we think about in addition to our two main deliverables that we put out is the environment that will actually be taking the Census in during the time we're conducting it. In the spirit of time today I'm not going to talk about each and every one of these bubbles or all of the constraints or the conditions that we think we'll be operating under, but I do want to highlight just a few because I think it helps explain some of the components of our design.

The first that I would point out is that of a constrained fiscal environment. I highlight this one because most of the time when people hear a constrained fiscal environment they think about one thing. They think about, does that mean will we have the budget we expect to have to allow us to execute the program the way we've planned it.

I highlight this one because we do mean that, but in addition to talking about a constrained fiscal environment in that sense, we also in the course of planning

the Census have to think about a fiscal environment in a very different sense. And that is one that we can't control and we can't influence.

And that means what will the economy look like in 2020. We need to consider what the economic - the economy will look like because it affects our ability to hire the skilled workforce that we need at the point in which we need it. And that's an important consideration for us as we plan the design of the Census.

I also would point out a couple of other considerations as we look to the design of the Census.

The next would be declining response rates.

We all know working in social science that response rates to all surveys and Censuses have been declining over the last few years. People are overwhelmed with information. They're worried about privacy. They're worried about confidentiality. They're worried about sharing their information. And they're bombarded with those requests.

This is the environment we work in today. This is the environment that we set out that we must count each and every person once and only once and in the right place.

In order to do that, we have to think about this within the design that we lay out. This combined with an increasingly diverse population makes it even more challenging for us.

We know that the demographic and cultural makeup of the United States has changed. We know that it's gotten more complex. We know that the number

of people that don't speak English as a first language has grown. Those factors have implications for our Census design.

We know that the United States is a very mobile population. Data from the American Community Survey tell us that 12% of the population move in any given year, yet we're talking the Census in a very short period of time and as I said already, our goal is to count everyone once and only once and in the right place.

So as we attempt to do that as we look toward that future, as we look toward implementing the Census and think about how we're going to achieve that overarching goal, for this Census we combined it with an additional challenge goal. That goal of conducting the 2020 Census at a lower cost per household adjusted for inflation than the 2010 Census while still maintaining our commitment to high quality results.

So how did we set about doing this? For those of you that haven't been with us on our journey over the last few years, how did we do it?

Well we stepped back and said, "What are the major cost drivers for the Census? What are the key areas that we need to look at first to innovate, to reengineer, to bring the cost of the Census down? How can we introduce new methodologies and how can we move the Census forward?"

When we did that we identified four key innovation areas -- reengineering address canvassing, optimizing self-response, utilizing administrative records and third-party data, and reengineering field operations.

What I'd like to do now for the next few minutes is really talk through each and every one of those four innovation areas. And I'll talk with you about how we're reengineering those areas and introducing innovation.

When I complete that I'm going to turn the floor over to Deirdre who's going to walk us through the operational plan and the decisions that we've made to date.

So starting with reengineering address canvassing. The goal for reengineering address canvassing is to reduce the nationwide in-field address canvassing by developing innovative methodologies for updating and maintaining the Census Bureau's address list throughout the decade.

So as we thought about reengineering address canvassing, what did we decide we will do? We decided that we will continue to canvass the entire nation. We're simply going to canvass the nation differently.

So how are we going to do that? What does the reengineered address canvassing operation look like? What does it mean to canvass the entire nation but to do it differently?

For us that means developing an operation that consists of at least three components with quality infused throughout.

The first component would be our in-office address canvassing. And I'll talk more about each of these in a second.

The second component of our reengineered address canvassing would be our effort to conduct a limited amount of in-field canvassing or in-field verification.

And the third component of our reengineered address canvassing is implementing a mass covered study that will occur on an annual basis.

So let me talk you though what this means as we look toward the Census design.

When we look toward 2020 and we think about what our need is for 2020 to actually execute the Census we first start by thinking about what will the universe look like, how many addresses will we have to enumerate in 2020, what does our frame look like.

A hundred-and-forty-three-million housing units in the United States and Puerto Rico, this becomes the basis for everything we're going to do with the Census -- nearly 143 million housing units.

We then begin our procedures to conduct in-office address canvassing. We are going to complete 100% verification of 100% address canvassed of the entire nation through our in-office techniques.

Just about a month ago now I was down at our national processing center visiting with (Dave) and with the regional directors and we went down about a half day early so we were able to see the set up for our in-office address canvassing. And they have a room, gosh, probably about this size where they set up the 60 desks for our in-office canvassers where they will be doing the in-office canvass. We were able to spend that afternoon talking with the supervisors looking at the technology, looking at the imagery, exactly seeing what it is our staff will be doing as they complete this in-office review.

Our in-office address canvassing is underway right now with a very small group of staff that will continue to grow as we enter this fiscal year to its full level. But as I said, we're going to complete a 100% in-office review.

Based on our 100% in-office review we know that there are elements of the country, there are parts of the country that will require some sort of in-field

verification. Based on the research and testing we've done to date, based on the results of the address validation test, based on the results of our own review of imagery, based on what we know from the delivery sequence file and other administrative and third-party data we estimate that about 25% of the addresses will require some sort of in-field verification.

Now why do we estimate that we'll need to do some in-field verification?

It's really simple and - it's actually not, but I'll try to keep it really simple from a couple of examples. (I think) it can help us complicate it later.

No, it's all good.

So first if we think about a large urban area, for example, where there may be large apartment buildings we have address information about that apartment building. We know it exist. If we look at two vintages of imagery we can see there's an apartment building in one and an apartment building in the other.

What we can't see is what's occurring under the roof. We can't see if there've been additional units that have been subdivided. We can't see the number. We may get some information from some administrative records or some third-party data, but this to us might require in-field verification.

Another example where we may need in-field verification might be in a very rural area where there's a lot of tree foliage where our imagery doesn't allow us to see below the tree line. There, again, we may require some in-field verification.

Again, based on the information we have to date -- the research and testing that we have accomplished -- we believe we can limit this in-field verification to about 25% of the addresses.

The third component of our reengineered address canvassing is what we're today calling a mass coverage study. This is a very critical component of our ability to understand and assess the quality and coverage of the master address file. What we will be doing starting in fiscal year '16 on an annual basis is taking a sample of 20,000 blocks per year and conducting a listing operation of those blocks.

The information from this mass coverage study will allow us to assess and understand the coverage and the quality of our address (stream). This is very important to us because as we progress throughout the decade we need this additional verification, this additional benchmark, to help us understand where we are today and where we need to get to in time for the Census.

Okay.

Moving on to our next innovation area, that of optimizing self-response.

Our goal for optimizing self-response is to generate the largest possible self-response, reducing the number of households that require follow up.

So how are we going to do this? How are we going to engage and motivate the population to respond and to participate in the 2020 Census?

In order to do this we must make it easy for them to respond anytime and anywhere. Our goal, again, is to get as many people as possible to be engaged and motivated, and to respond to the Census.

We're going to do this through a combination of things -- a nationwide advertising and partnership campaign, the use of tailored contact strategies, and the use of non-ID processing.

Let me talk a little bit about what I mean by non-ID processing. We haven't found a good way to explain it that's not technical so I find a brief pause and an explanation helps.

So, generally when we send out Census and surveys to our respondents we include either a 9- and 11- or 14-digit identification number. That's a unique code that when our respondents log in to our Centurion or a web collection instrument they first enter that code. That identification number links that respondents address back to the information we have in our master address file.

For this Census we're looking to deploy -- and we did test this in our 2015 test and was very successful -- the ability for some people to respond without a Census identification number.

Why do we want to do this you might wonder? Because it allows us to make the Census mobile. It allows us to take a program that we traditionally run during the Census like Be Counted and use it throughout the entirety of the Census.

It allows us to go in to small geographic areas. To interact with small demographic groups and say in these audiences, stand up and be counted. And for this Census it allows us to say, "Stand up and be counted. Now don't go home to be counted, we want to help you do that right here, right now. Please come over right here and we have a kiosk set up or a computer set up where you can fill out your Census form now. We want to help you do this."

The ability to use non-ID processing and to bring the Census into communities in real time allows us to increase that self-response rate reducing the follow up that we will have to do in person.

With that all said as background we believe that this will be a very small pot percent of the population, the respondents that will actually use non-ID processing. Our testing to date have shown us that most people will respond with the Census ID. And for all of our tailored communication messages that we're planning to send out, all of the invitation letters, we're intending to include that identification number on them.

So let's talk about how we're going to accomplish our self-response. How we're going to specifically engage and motivate people.

Again, there are a number of components - four different components that we're looking at that make up the entirety of our ability to innovate and optimize self-response.

The first as I said is an integrated partnership and communications campaign. We're very excited about this because it's a very unique way as we saw in the 2015 test in the Savannah media market for us to tailor our messages and our partnership program to local communities and try to encourage their response to come in that way.

In addition to that we're also looking to use our mailed invitation letters. In here we're really looking at a tailored contact strategy for our respondents.

We intend to invite the population to self-respond using the Internet -- a very important part -- for the 2020 Census, but one difference we're planning to implement for the 2020 Census as compared with previous Censuses is for this Census we will be using a staggered mail approach. For those of you that have been around the Census before you'll recall on past Censuses it was very important to us to have all of our in-home materials arrive on the same day so

the people understood that and we tied it very closely with our communications campaign.

For this Census in order to help us manage the workload we're going to deploy what we're looking at as about a seven day approach right now, staggered mailing. This will help us manage the call volumes as well as the workload that will come in as a result of that initial mailing.

In addition to using the staggered mailing, for the vast majority of addresses, that first piece of mail that they will receive will simply be an invitation to respond using the Internet. But for about 20 - up to about 20% of the addresses we do intend to include a questionnaire in the first mailing.

Now you may be wondering why are we planning to include a questionnaire in the first mailing if we're moving to an Internet-based Census. Because our research and testing have shown us that there's a large demographic group particularly the population over about the age of 65 and areas where there's low Internet accessibility that when they receive our invitation letters as we saw on the '14 test, as we saw on the '15 test, as we're currently seeing in the American Community Survey, the first thing they do is pick up the phone and call for assistance. They either don't have access to the Internet or they don't want to use their Internet to fill out our Census or our survey form.

By including a questionnaire in the first mailing - these are people that want to respond. They want to participate. By including a questionnaire in the first mailing we're giving them that opportunity to do so and we're hopefully balancing our workloads so that we can better manage it as well.

We're currently testing this approach in the national content test. One of our panels is what we call the Internet choice panel. The data are still coming in,

but the preliminary data seem to show that this is a very helpful strategy for us.

After we move from our first mailing we're going to have several other mailings. I should say for this Census -- for the sake of time -- there is the possibility of an address receiving up to six mailings. I also would like to point out that we're continuing to refine our mailing and testing strategy in our national content test as well as in our testing plan for 2016.

I'll talk a little bit about the fifth and sixth mailings. The rest of the mailings -- mailings numbers two through four are really are reminders and depending at which panel you're in or at which point in time when the questionnaire would be mailed.

The fifth mailing that we're looking at doing right now is another innovation area and it's also something that we're currently testing in the national content test. This would be an additional reminder postcard to addresses that have not responded. Generally we stop with four. In their national content test we are testing a fifth postcard mailing to see if we can get some late self-response in through the addition of this fifth mailing.

Part of our innovation behind this or idea for including it really came about as a result of our 2015 test in the Savannah media market where we were able to test one postcard among 30,000 addresses and we did receive an 8% response from that. So we believe that the mail does have some promise for us here.

I'll hold off on talking about the sixth mailings until I talk about our approach for nonresponse follow-up because the sixth mailings are directly tied to what we'd implement there.

I've already talked with you about the third component of optimizing self-response and that's our ability to use non-ID processing. Again, as I said earlier we estimate that of the 143 million addresses only about 10% of those addresses would actually respond via non-ID processing, but we do believe it to be a very promising way to reach communities particularly those hard to count.

The last component of our ability to optimize self-response is our Census questionnaire assistance. This will be a contracted solution for us as it was in 2010, but it is a way for our respondents to interact with our telephone centers.

We're currently estimating that about 15% of all the housing units will call with some question generating inbound calls to us and we expect to be able to do this in multiple languages.

One of the changes that we're implementing for the 2020 Census compared with the 2010 Census is that we expect our Census questionnaire assistance lines to actually take respondents questionnaires over the phone. During the 2010 Census when people called with questions we served as a question and answer, as a queue kind of place. We facilitated those questions, we directed them to where the information was.

What we've learned as the Census Bureau has moved using the Internet for more and more of its data collection is that when people are calling our questionnaire assistance lines they're actually sometimes frequently calling with questions about technology. They're calling because their browsers aren't displaying something appropriately or the form isn't populating.

For the purpose of the Census rather than getting bogged down in answering those technical questions we will have our agents simply quickly pivot and

take that response over the telephone. And this is a change for us from the 2010 Census.

Lastly, before I move off of optimizing self-response, I wanted to share with you based on what our research and testing have told us to date, what we believe our preliminary self-response rates to be.

So our preliminary estimated self-response rates after six weeks of data collection -- and six weeks is very important to us because it reflects where we need to be when we do our first cut for nonresponse follow-up -- is that we're predicting that we will have about 1 63-1/2 self-response rate at that point in time. About 47% of that will come in through the Internet. About 5.3% will come in through our Census questionnaire assistance line. And about 11.2% will come in via paper.

With that as background what I'd like to do now is talk briefly about our plans and our decisions around utilizing administrative records and third-party data.

As I talk about this I probably - just for your own knowledge, I probably will veer a little bit into reengineering field operations because the two of these innovation areas really go hand in hand and really speak to how we're planning to reengineer our nonresponse follow-up operations. But first and foremost let me talk about utilizing administrative records and third-party data.

Our goal with this innovation area is to use information people have already provided to reduce the expensive in-person follow up. For those who have not responded the Census Bureau will use the most cost effective strategy for contacting and counting people.

But let me be very clear about this. This is not an administrative record Census. This is a Census where we will use administrative records where the use of those records make sense. Where the use of those records do not make sense we will use other alternatives. And the use of administrative records -- as we'll talk about in a few minutes -- allows us to focus those needed resources in the areas where we need to put it. It allows us to spend the time, the energy, and the resources to help us ensure a complete and accurate coverage for all demographic groups.

So how are we intending to use administrative records for the Census?

We're intending to use administrative records and third-party data to help us reduce the number of visits by using available data from government administrative records and third-party sources. We will use them to help us identify vacant households. We will use them to help us identify what's the best time of day for us to visit a particular household. And we will use them to help us count people and to fill in those responses with high quality data from trusted sources.

As I've already said the use of administrative records will lead to significant cost reductions for the 2020 Census. It will allow us to focus our field resources to achieve consistent response rates across geographic areas and demographic groups.

So what does this really mean like in terms of our nonresponse follow-up operation? When we talk about using records what are we talking about using and how does that translate into the workload and into the population that we have to count?

As a reminder I've just told you that we estimate through self-response that we'll have about 63-1/3 self-response before we draw that cut for our

nonresponse follow-up workload just after six weeks. With that assumption -- knowing that we believe there will be about 143 million housing units -- we believe that there will be just over 56 million housing units that will be qualified for nonresponse follow-up after six weeks of data collection.

Just to put it in some sort of comparative perspective for you, the 2010 Census had 48 million nonresponse follow-up visits. Of those 48 million nonresponse follow-up visits that we did in the 2010 Census 14 million of those visits identified vacant housing units. We knocked in 14 million doors but there was no one there and there was no chance for no one to be there. They were vacant doors. Twenty-nine million of those visits were occupied housing units.

So stepping back to what we believe 2020 to look like. Again, we believe they'll be just over 56 million housing units qualified for nonresponse. And we'll draw that initial cut for nonresponse follow-up at that time.

At the same time that we're drawing that cut for nonresponse follow-up we know that we will get some late self-response trickling in. We know this from our past Censuses. We know it from our survey taking.

Based on all the information we have we estimate that while we're preparing for nonresponse follow-up an additional 1% of self-responses of addresses will come in late. That's about 1.3 million addresses. Because of technology we'll be able to remove those 1.3 million addresses from the workload so we won't have to knock on those doors.

Then at that point in time we will use administrative records and third-party data to identify vacant housing units and as a result of our use of the data remove approximately 11% of the nonresponse follow-up workload from our universe. That equates to about 6 million addresses that we believe we can

identify to be vacant using a combination of administrative records and third-party data.

What we will do for those 6 million addresses that we've identified that way is we will send them and this is where our sixth mailing comes into play. We will send in additional postcard mailing to that address that we've identified to be vacant just in case someone has moved in or something may have happened. But we will send that additional mailing to that. And we're actually going to test this approach in our 2016 Census test.

Now our remaining follow up universe is down to about 49 million addresses. We will visit all of those addresses once. And we expect by visiting all of those addresses once that we will be able to resolve somewhere between 20% to 25% of those cases at that time. Our models to date, the simulations that we've done in the testing indicate that we can resolve about 22% of them or about 11 million addresses with just one visit.

If we don't obtain an interview at that point in time when we're doing that visit we'll leave a notice of visit on the door and we're also going to send that same sixth mailing to this address as well. Again, a last opportunity to self-respond for the unit.

At this point in time after we've knocked on the doors once, after we've sent that sixth reminder mailing to the housing unit, if we have good administrative records and third-party data for these potentially occupied nonresponding housing units we will use that data to enumerate that housing unit. We expect this will happen for about 6 million addresses. This is based on the simulations that we've done using 2010 data as well as our field test.

While all of this work is occurring we'll continue to get additional self-responses in. And, again, we estimate about another 1% of self-response or

another 1.3 million addresses will come in. That then leaves us with a nonresponse follow-up workload of about 30 million addresses that will require more than two visits. And we'll move on from there and we'll continue to conduct our nonresponse follow-up.

What I'd like to do now is talk about the infrastructure that we're going to use to allow us to conduct this nonresponse follow-up for all of these units, all of these addresses.

We've spent a considerable amount of effort over the last few years looking at how we can reengineer our field infrastructure and our field operations. Within this innovation area we're looking to use technology to more efficiently and effectively manage the 2020 Census field work. Field workers will use handheld devices for collecting the data. Operations such as recruiting, such as training, such as payroll will be automated reducing the time and the staff required for these activities. We intend to use new operational control centers that will rely on automation to manage the work enabling more efficient case management. We're going to determine optimal travel routes for enumerators to follow. And all of these will lead to a reduction in the number of physical offices that we will need to have for the 2020 Census.

In general, a streamlined operation and management structure is expected to increase our productivity and save cost for the 2020 Census.

As we've discussed already at this point in time when we're doing - we've already knocked in every door once and we believe we have about 30 million housing units that will require more than one visit, at this point in time we are testing a variable contact strategy with up to six visits with looking at obtaining a proxy on the third visit.

You know, when I started this discussion today I started by saying that while we do have are all the answers to all the questions that we need to have today, what we don't have are all the answers to all the questions that we need to have for 2020. This is an important place for me to pause and to say that our 2016 Census test, one of the primary objectives of this test is finalizing that nonresponse follow-up methodology including the final staffing ratios for the enumerators, to their supervisors, the contact strategies whether we're talking about our tailored messaging or we're talking about the number of visits and the variable contact strategy that we're looking to deploy. So the 2016 Census test with that April 1 Census day is very important to us in order for us to really lock down and solidify our nonresponse follow-up methodology.

But with all that said we have made some decisions about what the infrastructure will look like for the 2020 Census. And please let me share that with you now.

First of all for the 2020 Census we expect to open six regional Census centers. These six regional Census centers compares with the 12 regional Census centers that we had in the 2010 Census.

We believe we will open up to 250 area Census office as compared with 494 local Census offices in 2010. About 30 of these area Census offices will open early. That opening of this office early will - is really in support of our early operations including address canvassing among other things.

And when we're looking at nonresponse follow-up and we're thinking about the number of trained enumerators that we must have to support this large complex operation, we're looking at needing to hire 300,000 trained enumerators as compared with the 600,000 trained enumerators in 2010.

And with that said that brings us through a discussion of the four innovation areas and it allows us to bring Census altogether at a very high level. One piece that I did not share with you all as we were doing it is that the operational plan that we're releasing today, that will be available on the Internet, really speaks to the 34 operations of the Census. And Deirdre is going to talk about this.

But this is just one of the operational plans. What we're talking about today is the high level plan for the Census. Each of the 34 operations of the Census will have a detailed operational plan of similar lens and detail as what you'll see today.

And with that what I'd like to do is pause and turn it over to Deirdre who's going to walk us through the plan itself as well as some of the operations.

So, thank you.

Deirdre Bishop: Thank you, Lisa, and good afternoon, everyone. Nice to see all your smiling faces out there.

Lisa just did a great job of sharing the major design decisions for the 2020 Census especially as they relate to our four key innovation areas. Those decisions were not made lightly. They were data driven and they resulted from years of our research and testing program.

You'll recall that from 2012 through 2015 we focused on developing, researching, and testing our key innovation areas. We conducted several tests -- the 2012 national Census test, the 2013 national Census contact test, the 2013 Census test, and the 2014 Census test. We went out and conducted LUCA focus groups with our partners interested in participating in the local update of Census addresses. We conducted a 2014 human in the loop

simulation, the 2015 address validation test, the 2015 optimizing self-response test, and finally the 2015 Census test.

As we were conducting all of those tests we were preparing to release our 2020 Census operational plan. Over the past year as we work to finalize our operational plan we refined our concept of operation for the innovation areas and we outlined the other operations that are essential for conducting a successful Census.

This slide presents a graphic representation of the 34 operations that are needed to conduct a successful 2020 Census. The operations are organized into seven major areas that correspond with the 2020 Census work breakdown structure -- program management, Census and survey engineering, frame, response data, publish data, test and evaluation, and infrastructure.

In this graphic program management, Census and survey engineering and infrastructure are combined into one general group called support -- which is shown at the top of the diagram.

Also, the legend at the bottom shows that for many of these operations, highlighted in dark green, detailed planning is well underway. For others, detailed planning has recently begun and for a few others detailed planning has not yet started.

Moving forward I'm happy to say that the 2020 Census program will ensure that scope definition, cost estimation, budget formulation and execution, and scheduled development and management will be conducted using these categories to organize our work.

These 34 operations shown on the slide today are described in our operational plan. As Lisa said it's important to mention that for each of these operations

moving forward we're going to create a more detailed operational plan drilling down and detailing the way we will implement these operations.

Now I'd like to spend a few minutes reviewing the major design decisions and a little bit of a different format. Some of these Lisa reviewed in detail, other I will share with you for the first time.

Recognizing that not everyone in the room lives and breath Census the way we do we thought it would be important to reiterate several of the decisions.

As you remember from the infographic, first we establish where we count.

Lisa mentioned that the address canvassing operation will consist of three major components -- in-office address canvassing, in-field address canvassing, and the mass coverage study. All will be (infused) with quality.

In-office address canvassing will be conducted for 100% of the housing units. This work will establish the workload for in-field address canvassing which will be conducted for 25% of the housing units.

The number of area Census offices used to support address canvassing will be reduced from 151 in the 2010 Census to approximately 30 in the 2020 Census.

The crew leader assistant position will be removed from the staffing structure for in-field address canvassing due to the increased deficiencies we're seeing from the use of automation. During prior Censuses this position served primarily as a courier shuffling paper between the enumerators and the crew leaders.

Administrative records and third-party data sources will be used to validate addresses within each Census block. And this work has already started with

production in-office address canvassing which began in September of this year -- as Lisa mentioned -- at our national processing center.

Next we move on to motivating people to response or to self-respond.

We estimate that through the use of an integrated communications and partnership campaign, when that uses digital advertising and social media and include various ways to contact the population we can communicate the importance of the 2020 Census to the U.S. population and encourage self-response. As Lisa mentioned we estimate that after six weeks the self-response rate will be 63-1/2%. Again, six weeks is important because that's when we make the cut and create the non-response follow-up universe.

We will offer an Internet self-response option in languages other than English and Spanish including those with non-Roman alphabets. We estimate that after six weeks Internet response will come in at 47%.

We will also offer Census questionnaire assistance with the ability for our respondents to complete interviews over the telephone with agents. And we estimate the response rate via this mode will be 5.3% after six weeks.

We will also provide a paper option for those to respond who are not interested in responding via the Internet or with an agent. And we expect that this will result in a response rate of 11.2% after six weeks.

Again, it's important to mention that we will send paper questionnaires to 20% of all housing units during the first mailing and we will send paper questionnaires to nonresponding housing units. We'll make that cut after two weeks to self-response.

As Lisa mentioned we will offer the ability to conduct non-ID processing here at the Census Bureau. Respondents will be offered the opportunity to respond either with or without a unique Census identification code.

And another important thing to mention, as we've talked about in previous PMR's, we will not offer a formal Notify Me option as a result of our findings in the 2014 and 2015 Census test.

Once we complete the self-response portion of the 2020 Census we must continue to count the population -- specifically those that have not yet responded. Recall that after six weeks we'll make the cut for our nonresponse follow-up universe. This will be approximately 56 million housing units that have not responded.

Use administrative records and third-party data to identify vacant housing units and remove approximately 11% of those housing units from the nonresponse follow-up workload.

We will then visit nonresponding housing units at least once. As Lisa mentioned we expect to remove approximately 20% to 25% of the remaining nonresponse follow-up of housing units through this visit.

We'll use administrative records and third-party data to enumerate the nonresponding housing units for which we have good administrative record data and we will remove approximately 16-1/2% of the remaining nonresponse follow-up universe at that point.

It's also important to mention that we will use administrative records and third-party data to reengineer operations of the past -- the vacant/delete operation and our coverage follow-up operations.

We'll also conduct coverage improvement operations as part of the nonresponse follow-up effort and as part of motivating people to respond.

We'll provide dedicated resources for unique populations such as those with limited English proficiency, demographically diverse populations and the hard to count.

To complete the workload we'll utilize a reengineered field management and staffing structure due to the increased efficiencies we're seeing from the use of automation and technology.

We will change the ratio of production enumerators to Census field supervisors from 8:1 in the 2010 Census to approximately 15:1 in the 2020 Census. Again, like address canvassing, during the nonresponse follow-up operation we'll remove crew leader assistants from the picture.

We'll reduce the number of trained enumerators by approximately 50% from 600,000 trained enumerators in the 2010 Census to 300,000 in 2020.

And, finally, the nonresponse follow-up operation will consist of both production and quality assurance components.

We will also conduct group quarters operations which will allow individuals to self-respond and self-identify the group quarter type for which they reside.

As Lisa mentioned we'll conduct Census questionnaire assistance. We'll allow respondents to communicate with our agents not only over the telephone but through web chat and through email. However, we will not use these modes to collect questionnaire interviews.

Additionally, we will not use text messaging as a data collection mode.

Finally, because of the complexity of our country and our operations we will require a large infrastructure. As Lisa mentioned and as I'd like to reiterate, we will move from 12 regional Census centers (that) we used in 2010 to 6 regional Census offices to support the 2020 Census. We'll include up to 250 area Census offices as opposed to the 494 that we used in 2010.

We'll reduce the number of training hours required for both our address canvassing and our nonresponse follow-up operations. For address canvassing we'll reduce training hours from 35 to 28 in 2020, and from 44 hours in 2010 to 28 in 2020. It is important to mention that we'll continue testing the appropriate number of training hours and the amount of online versus in-person training as we conduct the 2016 Census test.

The training pay rate for address canvassing and nonresponse follow-up -- both for enumerators and Census field supervisors -- will be $1.50 lower than the production rate.

Another important thing to mention, the 2020 Census will have two paper data capture centers. This is workload driven and differs from the 2010 Census in which we opened three paper data capture centers.

Whenever technically feasible and cost effective the 2020 Census will use enterprise solutions to help in processing and collecting and tabulating the data. For example, we'll use iCADE -- the integrated capture and data entry system -- for the 2020 Census which is currently being used for several of our surveys here at the Census Bureau.

And, finally, as related to infrastructure we will use a hybrid cloud design for scaling our enterprise systems when needed.

And, of course, we must not only collect the data but we must process it, tabulate and release the Census data no later than December 31 of 2020. A few short months from Census day of April 1.

It's important to mention that the tabulated 2020 Census data will be available to the public through the Census Bureau's Center for Enterprise Dissemination and Consumer Service Innovation. And you've heard this referred to as CEDCSI -- many of you.

The next slide presents a pictorial version of our 2020 Census life-cycle schedule. It includes program level milestones such as deliver topics to Congress by April of 2017, deliver questions to Congress by April of 2018, Census day in 2020 will be April 1, 2020.

The schedule includes key decision points such as when we begin opening our regional Census centers in December of 2017 and when we'll award significant contracts such as the Census questionnaire assistance contract and our communications contract.

This diagram presents the schedule at the highest level. We have a very detailed schedule within our program with over 9000 lines that are supported by over a dozen certified schedulers.

Lastly, I'd like to spend a little bit of time on the risks that are very significant for the 2020 Census program. The following slides will share some of our selected risks that represent the major concerns that could affect the design or successful implementation of the 2020 Census program.

Our first risk is, to execute a 2020 Census that reduces cost while maintaining quality the Census Bureau requires appropriate funding for the entire life-cycle. If the funding appropriated for each fiscal year during the 2020 Census

life-cycle is less than requested or not provided at the start of each fiscal year, then the Census Bureau will have to reprioritize our project which may affect our ability to reengineer our operations and systems supporting the 2020 Census.

In order to mitigate some of these risks we plan to formulate and submit robust cost estimates for the planned 2020 Census activities per fiscal year. We plan to develop strong budget justifications that demonstrate the negative impact of insufficient funds for the 2020 Census activities per fiscal year. We plan to prioritize our research, testing, and implementation activities by fiscal year on those areas that can significantly impact cost and quality and develop contingency plans to quickly respond to budget cuts.

The second risk I'd like to mention is the Census Bureau is planning to use administrative records and third-party data to reduce the need to follow-up with non-respondents through the identification of vacant housing units and the enumeration of nonresponding housing units.

If external factors or policies prevent the Census Bureau from using administrative records and third-party data as planned, then the Census Bureau may not be able to fully meet our strategic goal of containing the overall cost of the 2020 Census.

In order to mitigate this risk we're identifying our external stakeholders that have an interest in Census Bureau policies regarding administrative records and third-party data usage. We're developing a communications plan for identified external stakeholders. We're regularly communicating and seeking feedback from our stakeholders through venues such as this, the program management reviews.

We're assessing any impacts of changes to our design based on feedback that we're hearing and we're monitoring very carefully external factors and policies that may affect our planned use of administrative records during the 2020 Census.

The third risk I'd like to share today is that the accuracy and the usefulness of the data collected for the 2020 Census is dependent upon our ability to obtain information from the public which is influenced by - partly by the public's perception of how well their privacy and their confidentiality concerns are being addressed.

If a substantial segment of the population is not convinced that the Census Bureau can safeguard their data against data breaches and unauthorized uses, then the response rates may be lower than we've projected -- that 63-1/2% self-response rate -- thereby leading to an increase in nonresponse follow-up cases and an increase in our cost.

In order to mitigate this risk we're developing a communications strategy to build and maintain the public's confidence in the Census Bureau's ability to keep their data safe, researching the way other Census Bureau divisions, other government agencies, and the private sector to understand how they effectively mitigate the issue of public trust and IT security.

We're continually monitoring the public's confidence in data security in order to stay abreast of their possible and probable acceptance of our methods for enumeration.

Our fourth important risk is security breaches could happen to the Census Bureau's Internet data collection instrument to our mobile devices that we use for field work and to data processing and storage systems. IT systems and security controls will be put in place to block attempts from outside

infiltration as well as to prevent any negative impacts to services or data such as network disruption, technical malfunctions, or stolen or corrupted data.

If a cyber security incident -- such as a breach -- were to occur to the systems or the devices being used for the 2020 Census, then additional technological efforts will be required to repair or replace the systems and the devices affected in order to maintain secure services and data.

The mitigation strategies for this risk are to monitor system development efforts to ensure the property security guidelines are followed during the system development phase. To research other Census Bureau programs, other government agencies, and the private sector to understand how they effectively mitigate cyber security risks. To audit our systems and to frequently check our logs to help in detecting and tracing an outside infiltration. To contract with third-party testers to perform threat and vulnerability analysis. And, finally, to prepare for rapid response to address any detected cyber security incidents.

I'd now like to share - move from our red risks and share two more of our risks which are currently yellow. And I'll build on that as we have the discussion.

Our fifth risk that we'd like to discuss is centered around the notion that new technological innovations surface frequently. The smartphone of today may not look like the smartphone of tomorrow. However, the 2020 Census program must move forward toward building our baseline and our operational design which will be finalized and put into production for the 2018 end-to-end test.

And please recall we have immovable and unforgiving deadlines. We have to deliver the data to the president by December 31 of 2020 and we have to deliver the redistricting data to the states no later than March 31 of 2021.

If technical innovations are to surface after the design of the 2020 Census has been finalized, then development and testing of our life-cycle phases must be compressed if those innovations are to be adopted, resulting in less time to mature innovations in Census methods and systems.

It's important to note here that the closer it is to the start of the 2020 Census the higher the impact of late operational design changes and changes to technology. Thus while currently yellow this risk has the potential and will become red as it becomes later in the decade.

In order to mitigate this risk we're going to build versatile operations and systems that are flexible. We're going to keep our team members and management aware of evolving technical innovations. We're devoting dedicated resources to track and communicate innovations and we're dedicating funds to incorporate new innovations into our design.

Our final risk is that after key planning and development milestones are completed, stakeholders may disagree with the planned innovations behind the 2020 Census and decide to modify the design resulting in late operational design changes. And we are hoping this does not happen.

If those operational design changes are required following the completion of our key planning and development milestones and specifically the 2018 end-to-end test, then the 2020 Census program may have to implement costly design changes increasing the risk for a timely and successful 2020 Census and significantly increasing the likelihood of increased cost. Again, it's

important to note that as we approach the 2020 Census this risk will move from yellow to red.

In order to mitigate our risk for this category we've identified our external stakeholders that have an interest in the 2020 program. Many of you are sitting at the tables today.

We've developed a stakeholder communications plan for these identified stakeholders and working and communicating with you. We're regularly communicating to and seeking feedback from you in order to learn more about our design decisions and our research and testing.

We're assessing any impacts of our changes to the design based on the feedback we receive and updating our plans accordingly. And, again, we're monitoring external factors and policies that may impact the design of the 2020 Census.

Lisa started with the bottom line and I'm going to end with it. We have developed a comprehensive design for the 2020 Census. Our cost estimates are based on that design using best practices for cost estimation. Our cost estimates assume that the 2020 Census will receive the funding that we requested.

With that said, I'd like to say, again, we estimate that the cost of the 2020 Census using our new design will be $12.5 billion, avoiding $5.2 billion in cost as compared with using the same methodologies that we used in 2010 for the 2020 Census.

We thank you for your attention today, and now I'd like to turn it back to Lisa.

Lisa Blumerman: Thank you, Deirdre.

I think what we'd like to do now is pause. We have about half-hour for questions and discussion.

I've never known this group to be quiet.

(Trisha)?

(Trisha Derr):   (Trisha Derr) from the Office of Inspector General.

Thank you for sharing your - bullets of your decisions points, and the decision making processes, I'm sure, are very difficult. And there's a lot to take in and absorb and I think there's a lot under the hood that we could be here for days trying to absorb and learn about. So, I guess I'm going to have to ask first of all about the risk of the administrative records being red. What has led you thus far to make it red?

Lisa Blumerman: And actually before I start with that I was remiss in something. So bear with me for one second. And then I'll turn to your question -- which I won't forget, I promise.

I actually wanted to point out the rest of the panel that we have up here for the discussion piece. We have Evan who's our program manager over address canvassing operation -- I'm simplifying that -- Maryann over nonresponse follow-up, Tasha is here to speak to communications and our integrated partnership plans, and Mike Bentley for our self-response program. So I was remiss in not introducing the rest of the panel for this portion and I apologize for that. So in terms of the administrative records I think right now the calculation of the colors, it's a nominal exercise that we go through and we're ranking at the bar number of factors at play when we look at our ability to utilize administrative records. And I know we talked about this on a number

of occasions but up until we've had the design for the 2020 Census we haven't had the information that we needed to have an informed and educated conversation with our stakeholders. And that I think that really allows us to lay the foundation today for where we need to go for the future, and having the test data that we need from the 14 test, from the 15th test.

The results of the analysis that we're conducting on the evaluation follow-up to best understand how the characteristics might be different so we can have those informed conversations. These administrative records, as we talk about it, is a significant component for our ability to reduce the workload, the non-response follow-up workload. And as such a significant cost driver for us in helping us reduce the overarching cost of the Census. All of those factors play into the score but this particular item was given in our risk register. Are there questions?

Troy: Can you talk about some of the biggest decisions you cannot make today? And so, what steps or what tests, are going to lead to those decisions being made?

Woman: Troy, it's a great question. To me the largest decision that we have yet to make in terms of the side of the Census is that overarching methodology for non-response follow-up. What will the number of attempts the? What will the order of attempts be? When will proxy interviews come into place? How will that vary for reporters versus housing units? What all those factors are that we still have to decide why the 2016 test so critical.

The next piece behind that ended my perspective is our ability to successfully implement address canvassing. And for that for our re-engineered canvassing, the notion from going from an in-office canvassing, which we are doing and that having us do the infield verification for 25%. We know we can actualize that. We know that the procedures will work. But we don't yet understand

because we haven't had an opportunity to test it and our 2016 address canvassing test will lay the foundation for us for that. It's what the interaction effects are when we bring the various operations together. And to me those are some of the largest decisions that we still have to play.

Also, of course, some of the things we have to do when moving as always from proof of concept systems or prototype systems into production systems. I know we talked quite a bit about that over the last couple of years and one of the mitigations we have to that is our layering of the systems with each and every test. Where we're moving each system from his early phases into its next phase and scaling and as appropriate as we move forward. But we still are in medium stages so to speak of where we are and that development lifecycle.

If you'll remember from sort of welcome slide - my last slide laid out the major milestones for fiscal year '16. And at the bottom of that slide there was a graph, a bar that show the timeline for the 2020 Census moving from red to end like your gradation of blue and to a doctor gradation of blow. And, of course, you are looking at it and black and white. So it's not very helpful. But if you remember it from the screen what that image was trying to convey really were, at its simplest level, the three components of the phases for our execution. Moving from research and testing, into operational design and development where we are today, into the execution with the start of the 18 end-to-end test. I could keep going but that's probably sufficient for now. Are there questions?

Ty Mitchell: Ty Mitchell from Government Accountability Office. Thank you and if I wait someone might ask a similar question but just following up on some of the other decisions out there. That at can search and production so and the math coverage area of study seems to play a prominent role from here on out. And I was interested, I think you touched on this a little bit, if you could elaborate a

little bit more on some of the decisions that that coverage study is meant to specifically employ. I'm just trying to - it seems like a catch all for a lot of things that need to keep figured out. And specific examples of what that's going to nail down for you.

Man: So time I think for the intent of the math coverage study is to do as you elude a number of things. One is to help us understand the coverage, over coverage and under coverage in the map. The second thing is to give us an opportunity to collect some data in the field, to help us to understand how well our in-office canvas process is actually working. So we began executing that a couple of weeks ago and we'll continue that throughout the sense of lifecycle. But we need to capture some metrics to help us understand whether or not the work that we're doing in the office is actually working as intended.

And then the third thing that Ivy in the math coverage study is giving us an opportunity to do it is sensitive a field data collection operation of 20,000 blocks nationwide, roughly a million addresses a year. We're actually able to take the technology that we're using to collect the data in the field and make some modifications to it to help improve the process. So again, I think there are three distinct and important facets of the math coverage study. Again, to help us understand how well or some opportunities for improvement that an office canvassing process is bringing. The second is to help us understand the coverage from it over coverage and under coverage in the math. And the third thing is to give us an opportunity to test new field data collection procedures.

Ty Mitchell: Thank you, that's helpful. On the second point I guess I just want to make sure I'm understanding what the decision is that's been made regarding the role of the relative scale in-house versus infield. If one of those major objectives over the next few years is to learn how well an in-house is doing that means is it conceivable it's not doing what you want and those ratios are changing based on the capped math coverage study?

Man: I suppose that that that's possible that the 25% infield that we intend to collect and 2020 is - that number is moving but I think that what the in-office canvassing and the math coverage study allows us to do combined is to continue to refine those prophecies to get us to that 25% figure.

Ty Mitchell: Thank you. I have a couple of more questions but I'm happy to yield I see it other hands going up. I'm impressed by the statement of allowing everybody bitches to self-response. That's powerful and since his participatory. I'm curious when it moves to folks in group quarters and I know there's still some decisions are some things to be ironed out in that area but is there an elaboration you can offer on the thinking that's already been done on how that plays out if you're in a group quarter and traditionally you won't be giving that opportunity. It's a sense of potential to have a large increase and a duplication that maybe has to take place. If this were thinking on how that's going to play out just cause a large number of group quarters headcount.

Man: So operationally we are looking at group quarters - we've looked back at 2010 and we've asked us of what are the opportunities for improvement. Were the different modes that we could use to engage the group quarter responded? So certainly self-response is one of them. We intend to and actually we split a survey out to 259 group quarters organizations to find out what types of data do they have? What is the data format? And they wanted to share this data with us? So we're anticipating the have the opportunity to use stated that already exists to help build the frame of potentially and enumerate the population. We certainly will continue our research and testing around new methodologies or new opportunities to innovate one of those that is actually going to a governance board tomorrow is the use of basically an automation instrument that allows us to eliminate the paper aspect of some portion of group quarters enumeration. Does that give you some sense of where we're going?

Ty Mitchell:	That's all useful. Just to clarify the survey people giving you the 259 their own data that canvassing that you doing, is that analogous with soft response when a GQ gives you the numbers? That's not the same thing is it?
Man:	No.
Ty Mitchell:	Okay.
Woman:	Are there other questions? Dan?
Dan Cork:	Dan Cork, National Academies. Ty took my group quarters question so I think I've got too. The first one is you mentioned that coverage improvement operations will be included. And then there's the decision point where you mentioned that administrative records and third-party data will be used to reengineer coverage follow-up and they can delete operations. But coverage doesn't show up on that bubble chart of the main list of operations. A coverage follow-up operation of the same nature as in 2010 doesn't seem to be a natural sub item of non-response operations and telephone questionnaire systems you describe so far as being a purely inbound calling operation. So the question is do these cost estimates reflect a large-ish scale outbound calling operation of the coverage improvement or coverage follow-up?
Woman:	So there's a lot of questions in two questions. I thinking there's like ten in there. So help me try to course it. Let me try to (unintelligible) apart and I have a feeling that (Deidre) will pick up some and then Marianne will sound in as well. Let me start with outbound calls as a minimum.
	At this point in time we're looking to do outbound calling through a combination of ways. Certainly outbound calling may be within the scope of our Census questionnaire systems contract. It will in the deep conversations

with our national processing centers and looking at what our outbound operations might be there. So these are some of the decisions that will be part as we're moving forward with this system questionnaire systems contract and as we build out our operations are routed. But we have neglected outbound calls. We're just handling them in a slightly different way from the context of the conversations were having today. We do expect outbound calls to be some portion of a quality re-interview and I expect Marianne can talk more about that.

Marianne: When we think about the re-interview and we think about the non-response follow-up operation we are considering having an outbound calling to support the non-response follow-up re-interview. At this is primarily as a function of checking back with respondents with regard to act in enumerators visit to their household to try to collect the data. In addition, we are considering outbound calling as a matter of a coverage re-interview. Perhaps more similar to what you would think of with the 2010 Census coverage follow-up that may be checking...

Man: ...right. That I would apply to the main Internet responses and the mail questionnaire, quality checks things that (unintelligible) or large households or whatever come in that way as opposed to just purely quality control on the NRFU interviewing.

Marianne: Correct. Did we answer your questions or did you have other components to it?

Dan Cork: That's the main one. It's open potentially as part of a couple of the operations (unintelligible).

Marianne: Yes.

Dan Cork: I saw one in there. So the cost estimates to reflect some notion of outbound it's not just a complete unknown at this point. The next question is one of the decision points you mentioned, administrative records and third-party data source will be used to validate addresses within each block. And early on we used to use the example of the case where you would go from an office review to infield as being something that looks like a multiunit or something that looks like a conversion. Just to be clear if the use of administrative records and third-party data also part of something you'll be doing in an office review looking at address list that come out of the byproduct of the administrative records results. As a first check before you send someone into the field to look at it?

Woman: So there's several components of this and it's a question that we get asked often. It's a good one Dan and I appreciate it. To be clear it's not just the use of aerial imagery is the aerial imagery and combination with administrative and third-party data sources that will be additional verification for us before we would send something out. We also see it as an ongoing process. So just because we've done an office review in a particular area once it doesn't mean that it may not be suspect for doing it a second or a third time depending on what we see and what the data are showing as prior to heading out to infield.

Dan Cork: Those are the magic words. Thank you.

Woman: Are there questions? This is what happens when we moved to that afternoon. We should do this more often.

Woman: I don't know if we have anybody in and the over flow room. Do we have anyone in the over flow room? Okay, a couple of people have some questions.

Woman: No questions.

Woman:	Oh, thank you over flow room. And the other questions from the audience? All right, oh Ty. Sorry I missed you.
Ty Mitchell:	Just another quick question Marianne on the coverage re-interview is that part of the NRFU I'm looking at the operations and I know SERFU disappeared in the prior cost model is one of the potential cost savings and you mentioned data coverage is that some of that will be embedded in the NRFU box. Is that where that consideration is taking place?
Marianne:	Well, that's a great question.-Right now yes we're considering it as part of a non-response follow-up. It doesn't exist as a box in and of itself at this point in time. We will continue to research in the next few years to try to understand what the magnitude of a need for a coverage interview would be. I don't know if at some point that went to the necessitate us calling its own operation. So I reserve the right to maybe change our mind at some point in time and call that a separate operation.
Ty Mitchell:	Fair enough. I just wasn't - I was just curious where the think he was placed on the chart. That's helpful. And I notice on slide 13 when we're talking about the 22 1/2% of the work load resolved with one visit. That word resolved sometimes we say we getting responses - is 22.5% is that what we're assuming people that have responded based on your experiences or that include proxies, for example?
Woman:	I don't believe it including process. It was based on the data we have, the number of responses with one visit. Are there questions? Oh, right there. Oh, Ben, hi.
Man:	Following up on my last question could you talk a little bit about the decision around the provision of devices that I notice that was missing at present.

Woman: Sure, this is one of my favorite topics. I do me that. So as many of you know over the last two years we've been looking into the possibility and we still are researching the possibility of bringing in our own device for the 2020 Census. We tested a very, very small test in the 2014 test. I think it was with nine people around bringing in your own device. And then in the 2015 test we had a much larger test where we actually set aside part of the sample to go out and do actual enumeration non-response follow-up using bringing your own device as the primary way to supply equipment.

As part of that 2015 test, that went very well. There were a few glitches. We did, as part of it, identify a white list of devices that people could bring to participate. We had a few people show up with devices that were compliant with what we had expected them to do; things of that nature. But the test itself did go well. Qualitatively we didn't hear anything. A pushback from the respondents about an enumerator showing up with their own devices as opposed to a government furnished equipment.

With all of that said as background one of the things we will be testing in the 2016 test are three alternatives - three different approaches to the procurement, to the provisioning of devices. One would be some aspects of government furnished equipment. The second would be continued testing and to bring all device fashioned.

And the third would be a new alternative that we're looking to test and to deploy which is device as a service. At this is where we would go to our contracted solutions in lieu of bring your own devices where a vendor would be responsible for providing that device. We believe that that kind of solution based on some research we've done can help us achieve some of the cost savings that we would acquire through bring your own device without and mitigating some of the potential risk. But until we complete the Census test -

the 2016 Census test we won't have more information about that but it's a great question. Thank you. Are the questions?

If there are other questions I did just like to do one more thing before we take our break. We're a few minutes early. So I started the session with a series of acknowledgments and I'd like to do this in banks and I like to do the same at the end of the session. But I'd like to start by thanking a different group and acknowledging a different group of people.

As I said earlier on the development of operational plan, the development of a design of the Census is not done by just one person. It's not done by two people. It's not even done by three or five or 20 people. It's a collective effort of hundreds of people within the Census Bureau and are stakeholders and pulling together the plan for what the Census will look like. And it was a pretty monumental undertaking for us.

All the research and testing we've done to date, the conversations with our stakeholders, the ability to very quickly understand and analyze the data are, while at the same time working on the next test, and tested thereafter and the plans for the 2020 Census. So what I'd like to do is to stop and think those people that have been involved and have given so much already to the design of the Census for the work we had done.

First of all I'd like to acknowledge the operational planting. I know that there are many, many people that worked on this but we did have a core group of about a dozen people that spent considerable effort on this led by Ann (Rittenhour) was over in the corner over there. Thank you, Ann. I don't know if there are other members of the team in the audience. I know Harry's here. He was also on that team. That they could stand so we could thank them for their efforts I would appreciate it.

In addition to the operational planting well we had representatives from each of the program areas working on consolidating all the research and testing so we can have a robust design from the Census. There were hundreds of people working throughout the Census Bureau and continued to work throughout the Census Bureau on the individual project teams or at our international processing center or in our regions on the conduct of the test. For those staff that are in the room that had been working on the 2020 Census, if they could please stand and remain standing. And I have one of the pieces I'd like to do. But those of our staff that have been working on it I would appreciate it so we get could thank you as well. And while they are standing, thank you Frank. Thank you.

And lastly, the staff that are standing now are the staff that are still so integral to our program. This program is a living document. It's one that started back in 2012. Is one that we've worked on over the years, and we all know with any day, with any effort we put in, that they are staff that join our program and their staff that move on for new opportunities. I'm very pleased today that they were so many of the staff that had been part of working on the design for the 2020 Census that came back today to support us. I see a number of them in the room. If they could please stand as well we'd like to acknowledge and thank you for your effort.

So with that I would just like to thank everyone one last time. I appreciate all your interest in the design. I look forward to the forthcoming discussions. I know we're going to have and I look forward to a very successful implementation of the 2020 Census. So thank you all and I think will go to a quick break.

All right, I have to tell when to be back. Let's be back in 15 minutes.

Shirin Ahmed: Well, welcome back everyone. Good afternoon. I'm Shirin Ahmed and it was really great to hear about the 2020 operational plan. The operational plan gives us an excellent framework for moving forward. We're doing a lot of work now and there's a lot of work ahead of us. And what we wanted to do today and the next 30 minutes was to talk about some of the strategic operations that we're currently working on. Jenny, Kim and I are going to talk about the first the 2015 national content test which we're currently conducting. And then I'll give a brief overview of our plans for the 2016 testing activities.

Jennifer Kim: Thank you and good afternoon. Before I get started I'd also like to acknowledge Mike Bentley who is here, who is in integral part of the national content test. So we have asked them to reposition over here and be part of the NCT presentation. So last PMR in July we share with you that we were in the final preparation stage in terms of deploying the National Content Test. At today were happy to report on the successful launch of the NCT as well as our current progress and our steps toward completion.

On August 24 NCT was officially launched with the deployment of our major data collection operations which are the Internet, telephone, and paper operation. If you can see on the slide, NCT is a self-response test currently being conducted in all 50 US states, DC and Puerto Rico, just utilizing a nationally representative sample of 1.2 million housing units.

To give you a quick refresher on the major content areas that are being tested in the NCT, the recent Hispanic origin focuses on the several key dimensions that include the question format, response categories, and wording of our instructions and terminology. Relationship is testing new relationship response categories with the visions of the same sex relationships among household members, and the reintroduction of the foster child category.

And then within our household coverage research we are examining ways to collect a more accurate household roster. In order to test these key content areas as well as our various contact strategies for optimizing self-response we have deployed automated data collection instruments as you could see on the left. This slide shows the major operations that are currently in production. So let's look at each of the timelines.

Looking at the Internet you can see that the Internet instrument went live on August 24 precisely at 12:01 a.m. Our telephone questionnaire, assistance operations are open on August 24 at 9 a.m. When our paper (unintelligible) have begun on August 20, with a target and a delivery date of August 24. And last but not the least our re-interview operation literally began two weeks ago on September 21.

Now with the official launch on August 24 we began our mail operations on August 20 the Puerto Rico and August 21 for stateside. Let's look at contact one. For contact want our mailings was sent to all housing units in sample with a target in on delivery date of August 24. Looking at contact to mailings was sent to all housing units in sample with in-home dates for August 24 for the early postcards that you see here and August 31 for the remainder of our material. I would like to point out that while contact one and two were blanket mailings with the start of contact three we began our targeted mailing to housing units that had not been responded yet. So we're looking at contact 3.

Mailings were sent to not respond and housing units with in-home date of September 7. This included approximately 1.1 million housing units. Once again with contact formalities was sent to not responding housing units with in-home date of September 14 at. And this included approximately 770,000 housing units. Contact five this only includes panel six. Mailings was sent to not responding housing units within that paneled with in-home date of September 21 at this included approximately 92,000 housing units.

Now let's take a look at some of our preliminary findings. As of 9 a.m., October 5 these are the unrelated preliminary response rates. Overall 41.3% of the housing units in sample for stateside have responded as you can see in the blue bar. Looking at the purple bar there they are 26.2% of the housing units in sample for Puerto Rico have responded. Now we'll review it and break this down by mode.

Let's go and look at the stateside. So looking at the blue bar, the Internet you're looking at approximately 30%, 5% for phone, and 6% for paper. At the Puerto Rico a little over 10% for Internet, almost 4% for phone, and 12% for paper.

Looking at our steps ahead we will continue to press our data to the Internet and phone operations until October 31. Not keeping into, additional time needed for mailings and other associated activities with that we will continue our paper capture operation until November 16. The re-interview operation that I had mentioned began two weeks ago will continue until November 25 right before the Thanksgiving holiday. Study plans are currently in progress that will detail about our plans for data analysis and our final reports. As you can see here the NCT as well underway and progressing towards the finish line. And at our next PMI will be reporting on the core of that activity of the tests as well as the progress with our debt analysis. Thank you.

Shirin Ahmed: Let me go through the 2016 since his test and then we'll take your questions. So two months ago we announced at that part of the areas within Los Angeles County, California and Harris County, Texas were selected as sites for the 2016 Census test. We selected the sites for their characteristics which included language diversity, demographic diversity, varying levels of Internet usage and high vacancy rates. These characteristics will help us refine and test technologies and methods that really build on our researching testing before.

Our objectives are to refine our plan going forward on our technologies and methods specifically refining our self-response options and optimization of that. Here we want to provide non-English support for responses with limited English proficiency. We want to study partnerships and outreach efforts for hard to count populations. And we want to continue improving the non-ID real-time processing methods. There's a little error on the slides here. We do not plan to do anything with text messaging for the 2016 test.

Additionally, we want to improve our plans for non-response follow-ups. Namely, this test will allow us to refine the ratios of field enumerators to field supervisors. Refine our operational control system including the way that we assign work in the field as well as how those assignments are routed. We want to refine our use of administrative records to reduce the NRFU workload. And we want to enhance the compass application to handle special situations. And compass is the automated enumeration tool that we are developing for 2020. And as Lisa noted earlier we want to test device as a service. This is in addition to bring your own device and Government furnished equipment.

This map shows the test area within the blue outline for Los Angeles County. And this shows the test area also within the blue line for Harris County, Texas. So the sample sizes for the 2016 Census test will be 250,000 households in each site. Both sides will be included in the initial sample mailing and we will target the thousand households in each site to be part of the non-response follow-up operation. We're planning for test phases, self-response, non-response follow-up or NRFU with our re-interview component for that. I will do a coverage re-interview and will do focus groups as well. And I'll talk about each of these.

So for Internet response - for self-response we would implement an Internet push context strategy as explained in the operation of plan. That involves

sending a letter inviting people to respond on the Internet. Sending two reminders, postcards, letter reminders, and ultimately in the fourth follow-ups sending a paper questionnaire to addresses that still have not responded. Materials included in the mailing packages explained the test and provide information on how to respond. And for this test we will carry the content of the mailing packages in the Internet push contact strategy for the different panels.

For mail panels targeting limited English proficiency or LEP households will include a language insert as part of the contact strategy. LEP households represent a subsample of the housing units in each test location. And the materials will either be a letter, a FAQ or a brochure. We will also include the Census URL on envelopes with messaging in multiple languages for the panels of housing units. And Internet choice panel will also be tested. That really involves sending an initial questionnaire to responses followed by two reminder contact attempts and in the fourth reminder mailings sending a second paper questionnaire for any remaining non-responders.

We will continue to develop the infrastructure for non-ID processing. We will implement processing of non-ID response in the Cloud environment. And this is an important move forward because this will help us scaling out for 2020. We'll take steps to identify duplicate or potentially fraudulent non-ID responses. For all non-ID responses compare response data to information contained in commercial and federal administrative records that we had in house here at the Census Bureau.

Also, we will conduct a response validation operation to re-collect the response data for an estimated sample of 5,000 submitted non-ID households. Will do this re-interview in part by phone and in part by personal interview and we haven't yet determined the proportions for each of those.

And then lastly we'll offer telephone questionnaire assistance to all respondents and begin his responses call in and want to report their data by phone we will take it.

This slide just shows a summary of the full contact strategies for optimizing self-response. Again, each strategy is designed to increase the number of households that respond, that respond online, and of course, to gain cooperation of non-English speaking respondents.

In terms of content - the 2016 Census test questionnaire will include questions on housing tenure, household roster, age, sex, gender, date of birth, race and Hispanic origin, and relationship. And like the 2015 national content test we will include a combined race and Hispanic origin question. This combined question provides examples and write-in areas for each major response category including every response category for Middle Eastern and North African ethnicities. With this combined question format no separate Hispanic origin question is used. Respondents self-identify by selecting one or more checkboxes and then write in a specific origin for each checkbox selected.

The 2016 Census test allows us to test responses to these questions in geographic areas with different race and Hispanic origin's concentrations. Also, the inclusion of the combined question allows us to conduct imputation research and a test that has self-response and non-response follow-up and the use of administrative records.

We also plan to test a variation in terminology by comparing the abbreviated AM with American and the response category. Black or African-American respondents sometimes just see the American without seeing the black or African. So we'll test it both ways within the Internet instrument to assess if there is any impact on the difference in the wording. These data are important

for tabulations for the African American, African and Afro-Caribbean populations.

And then for the relationship question we plan to include variations in question wording associated with the non-relatives. We will compare responses to a relationship question with and without the response categories, roomer or border and housemate or roommate. Cognitive testing shows that responses did not know what the Census Bureau sees as the difference between these categories.

We will include the response categories recommended by the OMB inner agency working group for opposite sex and same-sex, husband, wife, spouse households and for the category of unmarried partner.

We have also added into the 2016 test a question on the Internet instrument that will allow respondents to report that a housing unit they own is vacant as a Census day and to provide the reason for the vacancy status. For examples seasonal or rental unit. We're testing whether this information could help us reduce the number of vacants in terms of non-response follow-up operations.

And then lastly the Census Bureau's research on how best to present and explain the residency rules, that is; who do we count in specific situations, will continue.

The 2016 test will we find our methods for conducting NRFU operations. In fact, this is one of the most important components of the 2016 test. As part of the 2016 test we will use our automated enumeration software or copies on standard smart phone devices. I will copies will have updated capabilities. Many of the capabilities we identified when we did the testing for the 2015 Census test and Maricopa County.

So it will have capabilities for handling a special non-interview situation such as demolished homes and nonexistent addresses. We'll have ways to better handle addresses for multi-units. For example, apartment buildings. And will have a clear path when attempting to collect data from a proxy whether it will be a neighbor for another knowledgeable source. And will also have a lot of improvement just in the look and feel of the screens themselves.

We will test the newly redesigned portion of our quality assurance activities for the NRFU re-interview program. Here, we're planning to test new methodologies for selecting cases to be re-interviewed. We actually want to use our automated infrastructure for doing the re-interview here. We'll use the compass device to actually do the re-interviews and with that will also use our operational control system to optimize the routing and assignment of re-interview cases for this activity.

And then lastly, we actually want to use the same field staff rather than a separate field staff to do the re-interview with the explicit rule that an enumerator is not allowed to re-interviewed their own work.

So in general with regards to the operational control system and the lessons learned again from the 2015 Census test we will continue to make further improvements and how assignments are made and routed. We will test improvements to systematic alerts that will quickly notify field supervisors of potential problem enumerators, detect possible falsification and improve both the quality and efficiency for the NRFU operations.

And then we will also test implementation of an adaptive design contact strategy using a varied number of personal visit attempts by geographic area based on criteria associated with people who are hard to count. We will also study when is the optimal point to discontinue attempts to collect information from each not responding household and instead moved to attempting to

collect information from a householder's neighbor or another knowledgeable source.

The coverage re-interview - so the 2016 Census test Internet instrument contains 3 embedded coverage experiments. Re-interview is needed to quantify the effects of each particular version on the roster provided by the Internet responded. The re-interview will be conducted by phone at our telephone sites at the Census Bureau and using our computer-assisted telephone interviewing software. So the re-interview will essentially re-contact Internet responders to determine if any people may have been left off the roster or erroneously included in the roster.

And then following the end of data collection - the Census Bureau will collect focus groups with the 2016 Census test participants to ask about their experience. And hear the topics will include opinions about our use of administrative records. We'll ask about general concerns with government data collection. And then also just attitudes and bleeps about the Government's ability to protect confidential data.

Now here are some of the key milestones going forward. We will start recruiting an October which is now and then open the area Census offices in January. Begin the self-response data collection in March and Census day is April 1, 2016. And then began the non-response follow-up in May 2016. And then begin the non-response follow-up in May 2016. And that's it. So we are happy to take questions if there are any. Patricia Derr?

PaPatricia Derr Derr: PaPatricia Derr Derr, OIG. Are you still calling the alert system mojo? Okay. As far as administrative records are concerned are they the same ones that you used in 2015? Are they different? What kind of new complexities are you looking at there?

Woman: Oh, that's a great question. Let me turn it over to Marianne.

Marianne: For the most part is the same set, the course set of the administrative records that we've used in the past for the 2015 Census test. There still is hope that we may be able to utilize SNAP data that may be available for the two test sites. But those negotiations are still in the work. We have no guarantee at this point that will be able to acquire that information and included as part of the test.

PaPatricia Derr Derr: Okay. So refresh my memory about the 2015. I know we used IRS data.

Marianne: IRS data, Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, (Numident) file. We use commercial sources. We use the Indian Health Service data. I'm trying to remember Tom; 2010 Census data and ACS data. And Tom (unintelligible) can jump off if you still back there and I missed anything.

PaPatricia Derr Derr: I'm just going to take the liberty of asking one more question on the new operation at NPC on address canvassing and now as you move forward and took these tests 2016 and so on 2017, are you going to have some kind of feedback glue that will, like they did the NPC over Houston and now they're out in the field and they see all these as having were nonexistent. Is there going to be some kind of feedback glue?

Tom: So we will conduct an office canvassing in both of the test sites in Los Angeles and Houston. And we have begun conversations about how to compare the results of that work back against the results of the test. I don't have nailed-down details about how that analysis will be done at this point but we are working on that.

Patricia Derr: Thanks.

Woman:	I apologize. I did forget a key administrative record source - the data from the United States Postal Service.
Man:	Ann, were you going to go next? I don't want to steal your questions. I got chastised during the break. Hi Ty Mitchell, (unintelligible). Thank you for this information on the 2016 test. Particularly this is great. Don't forget thinking about this in advance. A couple of things on the coverage re-interview - are you approaching that as a separable set of questions in a way of analyzing things or are there some aspects of the panel perhaps that you didn't mention here are some changes and questions or prompts anything like that that are being leveraged? I know, for example, in the 2010 Census there were the coverage prompts. Is anything working on the front and what the panel structure or anything? Or is this pretty much an exercise kind of on the backend of the test?
Woman:	So I'm going to try to explain this, and Julia Coombs is back there if I get anything wrong. But with regard to what respondents will see. They'll see one of three screens about the enumeration of the people in the household up front. One that displays the Census Bureau's basic residence rule, and then asks for the number of people in the household based on that rule. One that asks the number of people who live in the household that provides a residence rule definition in the help text. And one that asks if there are any of the people that live in the household with a residence rule in the help text. That sort of on the front end. After the names of the roster members are collected responded within see one of two series of undercount detection questions. One series ask for additional people on two separate screens and another series ask for additional people on only one screen. After the demographic items are collected the respondent within the over-the-counter detection questions. And we plan to develop

navigation which provides either a person based or a topic-based question related to the over count. Julia, did I get that more or less correct? Thank you.

Man: Thank you. You answer the question. What about the details as you get close? But there's close of investment going on in the front end of this and I'm trying to test the actual responses budgets analyzing what you're getting a what the re-interview at the tail end. Thank you that's very helpful.

On the re-interview and in my mind I'm thinking Claudia (unintelligible). Is the re-interview currently that you're planning for is it a matter of the demonstration of how this works with the change in the field structure and everything or are they different concepts in QA? Or are there different ideas that you're exploring within the re-interview that's different than how you've done things in the past? I'm thinking of the NRFU aren't type?

Woman: You're specifically talking about the non-response 50 the 15 re-interview. So what we're going to be testing in 2016 Census test will be primarily around the re-interview in terms of free contacting households. But what we're trying to do is infuse quality throughout the entire process. So we think about quality assurance for the non-response follow-up program we think of it from the very start and the way we are approaching our training and how automated training can build and quality.

We're thinking about it in terms of the tests that are administered a little, acknowledged checks that are administered throughout the automated training. We're thinking about it from the perspective of still whether or not we will be doing on-the-job training after the completion of training. The cop's application itself builds quality into the process due to add is that we can now build into the software to check for things as were collecting the data. We have the ability to do the operational control system to also build quality into the process through some of the alerts that are generated that can detect

situations that may be going on in the field so that we have an opportunity to address those situations while they're occurring and not waiting until after the operation is concluded.

When we then think about maybe more the traditional when we think about re-interview and the quality assurance from that perspective. We also have the ability to use additional para data that may be available to understand or give us confidence that the enumerators are performing the job as we expect or perhaps to raise flags that we may be sending some falsification going on.

We also have the ability to use administrative records when the data comes back to headquarters to check against the information collected by enumerated again to perhaps give us assurance that the data has not been falsified or they may raise a red flag that these are cases that we do want to put into the re-interview process itself. With the re-interview process that were testing as part of the 2016 Census test it will be through the in-field be contacting people we would not be testing the telephone component of that that we do hope to automate where we have as part of the solution for 2020.

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Any other questions? Dan?

Dan Cork: So just to continue on Ty's theme a little bit. That was part of my question but it's all good. I'm going in the same direction. Just to be perfectly clear, there is a dimension of the coverage re-interview piece and then also a mention of the non-ID respondent validation teeth also 5000 households. Those are two distinct samples. They are not overlapping. In the NRFU re-interview segment would include any non-ID cases oh what they have to go through Internet response channel with an ID attached to it? How was the NRFU re-interview sample selected?

Woman: The NRFU re-interview sample was selected based on that workload that originally went to non-response follow-up. Was conducted by the enumerators for the initial data collection?

Dan Cork: Okay, but is it purely systematic within that?

Woman: Yes.

Dan Cork: Is it looking at specific characteristics? Is it trying to answer five people who responded or is it a particular waste of coverage probe?

Woman: So let me see if I can break this up. And I may need other people to join in. The response validation component is selected from the non-ID cases where we had people self-response. So those cases will be selected directly from that. The coverage of re-interview workload will be selected from the set of cases based on the results of responses to the different options that I laid out in terms of the coverage probes I'll say. They'll be selected from looking at the characteristics of the responses from that group of cases. And then the NRFU re-interview cases are selected based on the sample that went to non-response follow-up. So I think they're pretty much distinct. Did I answer your question? You're looking very puzzled.

Dan Cork: No, no, pretty much. So the non-ID they're respondent verification piece. That makes sense and that upon the standard NRFU re-interview type of thing. Trying to get it an enumerator affect that will be more or less systematic based on the initial workload, is that meant to get some fraction of every enumerator's workload?

Woman:	So you're asking for the workload that we select for the NRFU re-interview will we be hitting every enumerator that conducted a production case during the...
Dan Cork:	So your answer is that they are a distinct case. I'm trying to get a sense of the mechanism by which you choose cases for the detailed re-interview.
Woman:	I think some of these are details that are still being worked out as part of the design for the test.
Dan Cork:	And then relate - I think the operations of the non-ID's, the respondent verification piece is separate from the others, I get that. The notion of that interview it just to get at the address piece? You're not going to do the full Census interview with them? I'm just trying to get the address piece correct. Is that right?
Woman:	I believe that the expectation - well, Lisa do you want to...
Lisa:	No no, go ahead.
Woman:	So I believe the expectation at this point is for the cases that are selected as part of the response validation that they would then go out and be subject to the entire NRFU re-interview. Not just from an address part. Okay. Details we sorted out, okay.
Shirin Ahmed:	Any questions?
Woman:	Actually my question a little bit about the process. So we had these big decisions but we know they are more little decisions to be made. How will we

find out about those others as you make decisions say like the YOD or whatever?

Woman: You'll see in the 2020 operational plan that we've outlined to not only the decisions we've made today but the decisions that we had yet to make. Some of those decisions will have to be made in 2016, some in 2017, some in 2018. We are keeping a full inventory of all of the decisions that are required for a successful 2020 Census and as we brief out to you at future PM laws and meetings back and forth will keep you abreast of the process related to those decisions. We do have a process in place to keep track of these.

Oh yes, on an annual basis were going to make updates to the 2020 Census Operational Plan. This is an organic living document that will change over time as we refine our methodology for 2020. We intend that the 2018 version of this by the end of fiscal year 2018 we will have our final design for the 2020 Census in place.

One more thing. Oh, and Lisa sorry. And one more thing. You know how we talked about the 34 operations for the production operations we will have a detailed operational plan for each of those operations. The first one out of the gate will be to address canvassing by the end of this calendar year. And that will really detail how we intend to move from the research and testing phase to the operations of implementation phase.

Man: It's blinking. Can you hear me? You're attracting the decisions. That's also. Are those showing up in your master activity schedule?

Woman: In the 2020 lifecycle schedule not necessarily all of the decisions. So some of the decisions are milestones but those will appear in the schedule. Others may not.

Man:	And then back to the '16 test that might be too early to figure out all the details but has there been a commitment – I'm not sure how to ask the question. Are we likely to see a major change in how you going to deal with multi-units for example? Some efforts on that.
Woman:	So what we're planning to do associated with multi-units in the '16 tests is test the new approach so based on the feedback that we received from the '15 test when many observers noted that we had multiple enumerators on the ground at a basic street address and multi-unit on any given day. And that those enumerators were going to the management office for example and asking for the same information perhaps increasing the burden on those management offices.
	We do want to take a new approach for 2016 where if you will think of it as an advance visit to that multi-unit structure prior to any detailed enumerator contact with respondents to collect information about the addresses that we know have not responded to the Census at that multi-unit structure. We can collect information with regard to whether that address was vacant on since his day and whether or not it is still vacant. From that we will be able to deal with some of the cases immediately. There are still additional work where we might have to re-contact after we have started all of the interviews and where we have triggered proxies and with enumerators may be in the mode of re-contact the management offices. We are talking about how we can coordinate those re-contact as well.
Shirin Ahmed:	Well, excellent questions. Anymore? Okay, very good. Well, what an efficient meeting. We're up to wrap up. Next steps. Oh, we don't have them. Did we go by them?
	No.

Shirin Ahmed: All right. There they are. No. All right. Okay, if you missed a day here's a repeat. Oh, that's the end. Okay, all right. You don't have tthe slide. I have. I'm sorry. Okay, well, first of all connect with us. So a lot of information has been shared today and you can see the team is very excited about the path forward and we hope that you are as well. Just a reminder that we had a few key milestones ahead of us.

Next year but this fiscal year rather we have several major contracts that must be the led like the Census questionnaire assistance and integrated partnership and communications contract. As noted before we going to begin our in-office canvassing in October. We are very excited about that. By December of this year were going to determine the locations for the regional Census centers and then in September 2016 deliver our preliminary residents rules. Will begin the advance mailing for the LUKA in January 2017 and then of course and April 2017 deliver the topics for the Census and ACS in April 2017.

Again, just reiterating our priorities with the '16 test we want to try and finalize our design for NRFU to the best possible extent that we can. Finalize our design for the field staffing and management structure. And then finalize our applications for use of the administrative records.

So with that I think everyone for coming. I don't know if Lisa had anything else that she wanted to say. I don't know if John wanted to say anything. No? No.

So I would just conclude by thank you all for coming. What did you today - your attention over the last few months in the attention I know you're going to continue to give us as we move forward. The operational plan for the 2020 Census will be posted to date no later than 4 o'clock. I know many of you are anxious to put your hands and to the best 300 pages that we have here and I welcome you to that. So thank you again for coming.